

DRAFT

The development of a RECREATION TRAVEL STRATEGY for a PART of the Colville National Forest

Purpose of this Document This document is designed to outline the way the Colville National Forest has taken steps to create a **Recreation Travel Strategy** for a portion of the Colville National Forest. This document is NOT the completed strategy; it is simply a draft “understanding” of the process that is being used so that everyone who wishes to participate in creating the strategy can join in. This is NOT a decision document, it is a document designed to create a common understanding of the issues surrounding **recreation travel** on the Colville, and some potential solutions to resolve issues.

Purpose of a Strategy The objective of a **Recreation Travel Strategy** is to begin working with concerned citizens and recreation enthusiasts to create an enduring program that protects Colville National Forest resources and serves the people recreating. Forest Service policies or programs may not cover many issues that face the recreating public. The strategy will clearly delineate what is a FS issue to address, and what is not. In addition, this is not a strategy for the Colville National Forest to implement alone. This is a strategy designed around citizens and enthusiast’s energy and efforts. This document will recommend that the strategy will be a regular annual effort that has included the input of an advisory group.

A Brief History of the Recreation Travel Strategy

Changing Expectations

The Colville National Forest is challenged with managing the changing face of outdoor recreation on the National Forest. The Colville National Forest is adjacent to rural communities that view the forest as a place to play, as a resource that provides sustenance in the form of fuel or game, and potentially as a source of income. In addition to these rural expectations, there is an ever-growing urban population that views the Colville National Forest (CNF) as a “get-away” for the weekend, and occasionally longer than that. In many cases, the rural and urban expectations for National Forest recreation activities coincide. In those instances, visitors from just down the road and from several hours’ away camp and play in a peaceful coexistence, neither finding the other an impediment to their fun. However, when a clash occurs, it is usually over the way one group is recreating in contrast to the other. It is almost certainly related to a recreation group’s expectation of the appropriate way to recreate in the area. Someone feels that the

other group just isn't playing according to the rules. In fact, "the rules" have been changing, and no one is quite sure what they are. The CNF is in the position of running to catch up.

One of the biggest elements of change in recreation and tourism has been in rural areas. In the past, rural recreation activities were closely related to rural characteristics back then: relaxing, easy-going, low-tech, traditional, slow and non-competitive. Rural recreation activities included things like walking, having a picnic, horseback riding, sleigh rides, and sightseeing. In addition to the quiet and unobtrusive nature of these activities, everyone who was recreating was doing the same types of activities, making the likelihood of conflict in user expectations very low. This could be aptly described as "the good ol' days" to those who enjoy those types of activities.

While these activities are still common in rural areas, expectations have had to change and expand for a wider range of activities. Now there is a component of activities characterized quite different from historical rural recreation. Now, many rural recreation activities have an extreme nature: active, highly technical, modern, fast, and competitive. This includes activities like off-road motor vehicle riding, orienteering, survival games, trail motorcycle riding, quad riding, jet skiing, snowmobiling, and downhill skiing. (Butler, pg. 10) To further complicate things, many rural residents are attracted to this more active and wild form of recreation activity. In contrast, many urban residents may be more attracted to the mellow recreation activity. Of course there is no way to predict what type of recreation activity a rural or urban resident might engage in just based on where they live. In many cases, people participate in *both* the traditional and modern forms of rural recreation. The point to see here is this: expectations about rural recreation have changed radically, and it is these differing expectations that create conflicts between users.

Increasing Demand with Limited Resources

The Colville National Forest is a relatively small forest located in the extreme northeast portion of Washington state. It is comprised of three districts located in three distinct river valleys. The predominate land forms run in a north-south fashion, with the major travel routes following a similar pattern along the rivers. The communities that recreate on the CNF are located in these valleys, with a large amount of users coming from the Spokane valley and its communities.

As the populations in these communities have increased, there is a natural and predicable increase in use occurring on the CNF. Census data shows the following population data for the counties surrounding the Colville NF.

County	2000 Census Data on Population	2000 Census Data: Percent Change, 1990-2000	Estimated Population in 2013
Pend Oreille County	11,732	31.6%	16,551

Stevens County	40,066	29.5%	55,431
Ferry County	7,260	15.3%	8,703
Spokane County	417,939	15.7%	503,240

While demand for all recreation in general has increased on the CNF, there has been a change in distribution and demand for specific recreation activities. While the Colville National Forest does not at this time have detailed information about specific recreation demands, we know that it is changing, and that all recreation demand is increasing. The Forest has been participating in the National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) effort that the National Forest System has funded. The data will be available as early as spring 2004. It is our hope that this data can serve as a baseline to compare future changes for demand on the CNF.

Methodology

What is a Strategy?

A strategy, in this case, is a written document that records the ideas for managing recreation travel on the Colville National Forest. It is not a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document, because it is not a decision document for specific land or resource altering activities. Rather, it is a concept paper that future managers can use to determine future projects, some of which may fall under the provisions for a National Environmental Policy Act document. This document has no “appeal process” as defined by NEPA. Instead, it will be a living document, changing with the needs inherent in managing recreation travel. Basically, if more good ideas come along to solve a problem, and new partners are stepping up to create a fix, the strategy is meant to be flexible enough to include them.

Why do a Strategy??

The CNF has committed to doing a strategy because the Forest Leadership believes this will be a mechanism to focus energy effectively on the recreation travel program. Creating a strategy is the art and science of employing the political and economic forces of the user groups to maximize support for agency policy on managing recreation. By getting all of the groups that are interested in recreation travel participating in the program, the Forest feels the money for managing these resources will be maximized, while creating informed and educated user groups that will help in that management. This is in the best interest of the public that is participating in recreation travel.

The Colville is also interested in meeting obligations for managing all of the other resources on National Forest System Lands. Completion of a strategy will become vital

in determining direction for activities adjacent to recreation travel corridors. In the end, the Colville National Forest would like to be able to portray its role as a recreation travel provider to the communities it serves. This will allow the CNF to stand up under the ever-present scrutiny of projects and programs as they are implemented.

What activities will be addressed with the Strategy?

The Strategy is addressing recreation travel on the CNF. This includes all moving recreation activities, such as: driving for pleasure, bike riding, mountain biking, snow-cat riding, horseback riding, motorcycle riding, quad riding, hiking, cross country skiing, snowmobile riding, tele-skiing, skate boarding, lama packing, hunting, full size four wheel driving, geocaching, fishing, wildlife viewing, rock climbing, huckleberry picking, mushroom picking, roller boarding, roller skiing, prospecting, rock hounding, and walking for pleasure.

This strategy will not be directly changing any rules, regulations, laws, policies, land allocations, or land management direction. Rather, this strategy is an approach to determining effective use of land management direction. This strategy will also create a forum to discuss issues related to such rules and regulations.

Where will the Strategy be in effect?

The Colville National Forest Leadership team, comprised of the rangers from each of the Districts, the Forest Staff, and the Forest Supervisor feel that the strategy should initially begin to be implemented in a portion of the Colville National Forest. The area that would like to see it initially implemented is in the center of the Forest, located on the Newport and Three Rivers Ranger Districts. It can be described as the area from just north of the Tiger Highway (Little Pend Oreille Motorcycle Trail System) at the northern extreme, to Highway 20 bounding it on the east, and Highway 395 on the west, to the edge of the National Forest in the south.

Map of the project area

This will be included as a later date

How was the Strategy done?

Early on in the process of creating a Recreation Travel Strategy, it was determined by forest staff that no strategy would be effective without extensive public involvement. With that in mind, a process was needed that would create a forum where all interested publics could participate without feeling threatened or intimidated by others who might have conflicting interest with their own. It was important to have all the players in the same room at the same time, so that everyone could hear what everyone else was saying, thus taking the Forest Service out of the middle as the “go between” or “interpreter.” It was also important that it be open ended, so that everyone who wanted to be included could be, on his or her own time line. The solution to this problem came to be known as “collaborative learning.”

Collaborative learning is a recent innovation to gain meaningful public participation in planning. This relatively new process is being used in communities where public land management is highly contentious. Collaborative learning is useful as a public participation tool because it incorporates and involves individuals and groups from very different interests and provides a forum for them to interact and learn from each other, from experts in the field, and from the agency, and for the agency to learn from all of the above.

Currently, there are many reasons for conflicting interests in recreation travel on the Colville National Forest. There are multiple parties interested in how recreation travel is allowed, who is allowed to go where, and when. Many are interested because they recreate with motorized vehicles and many are interested because they would like to recreate *away* from motorized vehicles. This creates a variety of issues. Many issues are created because of cultural differences, with many recreation users having deeply-held values in the way they recreate. Additionally, many recreate in several different ways, crossing boundaries between motorized and non-motorized interests. There are also some strong lines drawn over expert knowledge, either for or against the use of motorized vehicles on public lands. In addition, there are conflicting laws, regulations, and policies that make the management of recreation travel even more confusing and contentious.

Given the complexity of the issues surrounding Recreation Travel management, it is evident that “traditional” routes of “informing and educating” the public will not be sufficient to create an enduring Recreation Travel Strategy for the Colville. In addition, there are many aspects of a solid Recreation Travel Strategy that are best provided by the user groups themselves, both to manage access and access restrictions. The best-case situation is where technical expertise and citizens’ traditional knowledge can be integrated to provide an efficient, effective, and publicly supported set of management choices.

There are several key notions that define collaborative learning which include:

- Redefining the task at hand, not as solving a problem or resolving a conflict, but as improving a situation;
- Viewing the situation as a set of interrelated systems;

- Defining improvement as desirable and system change as feasible;
- Focusing on concerns and interests rather than positions;
- Encouraging interrelated system thinking rather than linear thinking;
- Recognizing that considerable learning about science, issues, and value differences will have to occur before improvements are implemented; and
- Featuring communication and negotiation interaction as the means through which learning and progress occur.

Successful collaborative learning provides quality communication, which includes constructive discussion of ideas, collaborative argument, and interaction. Regardless of the setting or group size, collaborative learning encourages competent communication by implementing interaction guidelines (i.e. “ground rules” that value a diversity of opinions) and by emphasizing various interrelated communication skill areas. These include: listening; questioning and clarification; feedback; modeling; reframing the situation; dialogue; and collaborative argument skills.

There was a learning curve for participants, agency and citizens alike. All that was asked of those who committed time and energy to this process was to keep an open mind and respect others’ opinions. Evaluations from both agency and citizen participants have been favorable and constructive during this process. Citizens felt they were listened to and that their knowledge and input were respected. Participants valued the emphases on basic learning, constructive communication, and generation of specific management improvements. Citizens appreciated the opportunity to interact with Forest Service personnel, and the Forest Service appreciated the productive interaction with user groups and concerned citizens.

Who attended the meetings?

There was a series of six meetings. A sign-in sheet was provided, complete with all contact information necessary to provide information for the next meeting. Email was the primary source of information dissemination between meetings. Newspaper articles were sent to the Colville National Forest media contacts for each meeting. A complete list of participants has been collected. Because it was an adaptive process, the meeting locations and dates were not predetermined, which allowed for flexibility in the pace of the collaborative learning process. Participants were from Spokane Mountaineers, Back Country Horsemen of Idaho and Washington, Blue Ribbon Coalition, Selkirk Conservation Alliance, Pantra, Spokane Winter Knights, Selkirk Ridge Riders, Sandpoint Ridge Runners, North Idaho Access Alliance, Kettle Range Conservation, Colville Drift Riders, Chewelah Sno-Posse, Good Times ATV Club, Selkirk Trailblazers, Public Lands Council, and several independent people. This list is not meant to be all-inclusive; rather it is to give people a flavor of the participation of organized clubs.

Where did the information for the strategy come from?

The strategy is comprised of information taken from participants in the six meetings held on the Colville. While this information was taken, it was intended to be applied to a limited area within the Colville. This strategy was written with the intent that all participants can make a correlation between the inputs that they gave as individuals, and how that will be used by the Colville to make improvements to the recreation travel situation. To preserve the integrity of the information, all participant quotes have been used directly off of the forms that we used, and flip charts that we created from discussion, and the email comments we have received. All of this information is available at the Newport District office. Of course some “editing” is required to make the information readable. To indicate what is a direct quote from a participant, a single round black bullet precedes the quote, as shown below:

- This is a direct quote from a participant

In order to organize the information, similar information was gathered together by concept. A label was attached to the concept as a heading. Those heading use *italics* and **bold** to indicate a heading created by the Forest Service for organization. If participants do not feel the information was organized fairly, or labeled and grouped in an incorrect manner, then please indicate this. An example of a heading is shown below:

This is an organizational heading

Because of the wealth in information that was provided, there was some level of duplication. In cases where concepts were duplicated, we deleted one or more of the duplicated concepts. Sometimes, one quote may have had several concepts. If they needed to be separated for readability, that was done.

On the discussion of the issues associated with recreation travel, the group spent two full meetings reviewing what has not been working very well. While this information was very important to understand, it had to be condensed and organized to make this document a reasonable page length. Where we have done condensing a square symbol is used to indicate, as shown below:

- This is a condensed concept from a larger group of information

What are the issues that need addressing?

We sent a series of questions home with participant so that they could tell the CNF what was of particular concern to them as participant of this process. In order to maintain the integrity of this process, these quotes are direct from the participants. Duplications were removed for the most part. This is what we heard:

Issues about communication of rules

- Enforcement and education is lacking
- Communication within the agency or multi-agency
- Active management with information about what the rules are in an area
- Our process fits into the guidelines, standards, regulations set forth in any B.O., Forest plan, NEPA, NFMA, Executive orders.
- Local knowledge and common sense—what is important is common sense in communication.
- Don't know where it's legal to ride.
- The rules change all the time.

Issues about access

- Access
- Snowmobile (pro), trail access (lack of), sno-parks
- ORV access, single track, keeping single track and adding more loops, stopping any closures.
- Access to public lands that have been closed, or are to be closed in the future.
- Although all the issues deserve consideration, many are highly exaggerated while others are basically concealed. However, ACCESS to public lands is my primary concern.
- Hunting, fishing, ATV, horse access.
- Access—closure of land areas (fire danger), of ORV users, with *forest approved* spark arrestors! However, campers etc can have stoves running in the woods, for example.
- Single track and 4x4 quad access
- Keep access open for single track use.
- Access for motorized activities
- Maintaining the single track uses
- Snowmobiling, ORV use (wheelers, 4x4s, motorcycles) hiking, hunting
- Closing off areas of our use, limiting our access.
- Snowmobiles (trails, roads), more sno-parks to be used also for 4-wheelers.
- The situation map is not the current problem. Losing access to all areas is our problem. It continues to increase.
- Trail closures because trails cannot keep cleared trailheads for these trails
- Use of the land
- Access to all open forest roads, jeep, 4x4, etc. All roads should be open (not needed to be maintained)
- Access to jeep drivers along with single track vehicles.
- LPO and Batey Boulder ORV trails. The issues I am concerned about are the preservation of current single track trails.
- Single track trails and more of them and maintenance
- More campsites with access to these trails (more access for all groups.)
- Campsites—used and ORV (family user friendly)
- Seasonal use—snowmobile, cross country trails, ORV
- Continued access for all motorized use is my only concern.

- Building new trailheads
- Access closures for snowmobiles in big game winter feeding grounds. Snowmobile trails help big game in deep snows. We have more large animals in snowmobile areas than in so called winter feeding grounds and less winter kill in snowmobile areas. (Proven in Seeley Lake MT)

Issues about available information and education

- No one knows what's going on
- People don't have any idea what they are supposed to be acting like.
- There is lots of information available, but you can never find it on the Colville
- There are no good signs out there

Issues about ethics

- Maintaining separate trails
- Separate use between quads and motorcycles.
- Creating alternative areas for other non-compatible uses
- Needs of non-motorized and motorized users are met.
- Concentration of motorized users.

Issues about management

- The forest has not applied accepted OHV planning techniques
- The main issue: is this an ORV system? Was this paid for with ORV funds and still maintained by ORV funds? If so leave it to ORV use. There was no trail system in 1980. We motorized users have never complained about horsemen, bikers, hikers, backpackers, huckleberry pickers using these trails (the only true American trail (open to all) closed to none. Leave this system as it is let greenies build their own trails with picks and shovels on land they have closed.
- The forest may not know what is necessary to encourage OHV use. They have not adequately encouraged the use and they have excused problems.
- Leave single track system alone
- Don't change anything, maintain trails, don't take them away.
- ORV use, single track
- Non-motorized trail use: hikers, equestrians, mountain bikers.
- Hiking, equestrians, mountain biking
- Hiking trails
- OHV use on the forest is impacting other uses and users

Issues about the economy and tourism

- The economy for the people in the county (all).
- Healthy economy
- Snowmobiling, ORV, fishing, hunting, economy, tourism.
- Funding is not adequate as it is currently distributed.

- ORV funds keep ORV systems open

Issues about user getting along with each other

- Minimize conflicts between motorized and non-motorized use.
- Conflict of user needs/wants, hence creating dispersed recreation amongst motorized and non-motorized.
- Landowners block out people
- Respect among all users toward each other.
- User conflict.

Issues about the environment

- Environment
- Motorized use, wildlife habitat, economy, non-motorized use, wildlife habitat, fire risk, ecological systems.
- Protection of wildlife, particularly T&E species.
- Excluding ORV access to not include special places like lakes and historic sites.
- T&E recovery
- Existing...of OHV use by the Forest allows unmanaged cross country travel and this effects recreation experiences and resources
- There are some areas where OHV use is causing damage to other resources.

The Purpose of Issue Statements

The process of getting all of the issues about **recreation travel** written down and documented was extensive. The group spent a total of three meetings, each meeting lasting approximately 2 ½ hours. The number of different participants totaled over 140 individuals. As stated previously, all written discussion is still available in the file for this project. If, after reading this draft you believe you have an issue that has not be adequately represented in this document, please contact Debbie Wilkins so that she can add it to the discussion presented here.

After the first full meeting discussing issues, it was determined that the process was going too fast, and that more time was needed to delve deeper into the issues. As you can see from the above discussion, there are basically eight different issues that were portrayed by the group. At that point, the issues were grouped into like topics, and given the eight basic “Issue Statements.” We used these eight Issue Statements through out the rest of the discussions. It created a way to organize the information so that participants could track progress from one meeting to the next. One entire meeting was spent on further discussion for Issue Statement 1-4, and another meeting on Issue Statement 5-8.

Given that we had almost 20 pages of issues, we tried to gather issues into like statements. They are portrayed below in a condensed version.

Issue Statement One

1. **No clear understanding or communication of current regulations and policies: don't know where it's legal to ride, don't know when others are breaking the rules, get different message from the agency, rules seem to change in mid-stream.**
 - ❑ Knowledge of rules and regulations is necessary in order to understand what is allowed. This requires a high degree of involvement by the user.
 - ❑ Misunderstanding and confusion due to poor communication: users do not know where they are allowed to go, and sometimes receive conflicting answers from Forest Service personnel.
 - ❑ When regulations are unclear, should we assume it is legal to ride/use the trail, or illegal?
 - ❑ Why are users not allowed to ride on *all* primitive and/or gravel county roads?

Issue Statement Two

2. **Need to be assured of access for all users and interest groups. Need to provide for a particular activity or sport.**
 - ❑ We *all* have the *same* access. It is only the *means* of access that is, in some cases, restricted.
 - ❑ Approximately 48 miles of motorized trail, and 115 miles of non-motorized.
 - ❑ The Colville National Forest *is* a multi-user group area.
 - ❑ Many trailheads do not accommodate the user groups needs, as far as parking space for trucks, turn-around space for horse trailers, etc.
 - ❑ Concerns about segregation.
 - ❑ OHV users should receive as much trail mileage as non-motorized users.
 - ❑ Lack of access leads to overuse of the trails that *are* open and accessible.
 - ❑ There is not enough enforcement to monitor illegal access.

Issue Statement Three

3. **Need for information and education.**
 - ❑ There *are* maps, and a process is underway to improve education and communication of information.
 - ❑ Maps are outdated, incomplete, confusing, and often unavailable.
 - ❑ Visitors from other areas are more likely to have problems finding their way around and accessing maps and information.

Issue Statement Four

4. **Need for user ethics: sharing of users, conflicts with user groups, conflicts with other user groups.**
 - ❑ Most people are courteous, and the education that exists now does enforce courtesy.

- ❑ It is often misunderstood that users are generally multi-users and not just affiliated with one specific group.
- ❑ The USFS is not able to manage conflicts or enforce the rules.
- ❑ Hikers concede that OHV users are the problem, and OHV users concede that hikers and non-motorized users are the problem.

Issue Statement Five

5. Ability of the Forest Service to manage recreation: not enough money, doesn't fix facilities, doesn't address safety concerns, doesn't fix resource damage, doesn't enforce regulations and rules that exist.

- ❑ Forest Service employees are motivated, well trained, and try hard to manage recreation. They do what they can with the amount of money they are provided.
- ❑ Volunteers do much of the work.
- ❑ Lack of funding, resources, and enforcement.
- ❑ Lack of enforcement leads to misunderstanding and confusion.
- ❑ USFS offices are closed on the weekends.
- ❑ The public feels that the USFS makes up rules as it needs them without going through and informing the public.
- ❑ Concerned with efficiency of USFS: "What happened to the old past—all roads, trails, etc were maintained by Forest Service people with 1/3 of the staff they have now. Now it's contracted out even though the Forest Service staff is tripled in size. What do they do?"

Issue Statement Six

6. Concerns about the economy and tourism, with or without any particular user group.

- ❑ As natural resources industries (mining, logging, etc.) decline, local population needs other sources of income. Motorized users of national forest lands provide positive economic effect. Tourism is not only by non-motorized vehicles. Recreation generates revenue from sales, parts maintenance, and travel (restaurants, motels, quick stops, etc.)
- ❑ Recreation adds money flow into rural communities; economy could rise with more access to recreation areas.
- ❑ Possible closures of recreational areas have a negative effect on the economy: small businesses close, etc.
- ❑ If tourism is unregulated, it will add chaos, miscommunication, and resource damage.

- ❑ The attitude that forests belong *more* to local residents does not help the economy.

Issue Statement Seven

7. Need for compromise: need for better communication, need for multi-use trails that are only non-motorized, need for non-motorized users to accept motorized use.

- ❑ Motorized users need to accept that there should be places they are not allowed, and non-motorized users need to accept that there should be places motorized use is allowed. If this is understood, there will be more use.
- ❑ There should be both multi-use trails and designated trails, with understanding and respect between all groups to avoid conflict.
- ❑ Hikers often seem to think that motorcycle riders are intruding on their private trails, treating riders as interlopers. Since they have their own non-motorized trails, it seems only fair that they respect our presence on multi-use trails.
- ❑ There is often no respect between user groups.
- ❑ There is not enough enforcement of regulations.
- ❑ The protection of ecosystems and wildlife habitat don't have recreational user voices speaking up in the process—this affects hunters, fishes, photographers, wildlife, and bird viewers.

Issue Statement Eight

8. Concerns about all use and how it affects the environment.

- ❑ If trails are built to code and users are provided with ample opportunities, less resource damage occurs.
- ❑ Most people believe that preserving the environment is worth their time and money.
- ❑ Most users advocate, within their user group, good stewardship.
- ❑ There are differing opinions on the effect of OHVs on the environment. Motorized users say there is little to no effect on the environment, while non-motorized users claim that the effects can be quite harmful.
- ❑ People need more information.
- ❑ There is a lack of enforcement.
- ❑ Forest fires and logging operations do more damage than OHVs.
- ❑ “Some users deny or excuse the damage their group causes. Their ignorance perpetuates a continuation of the legacy of damage. Because of the groups that don't practice stewardship, many deny any impact.”

Purpose of Including Everyone in the Strategy

At the first meeting, everyone was asked who they felt should be included in a strategy. Originally, this strategy was intended to address Off Highway Vehicle travel on a portion of the Colville. At the every first meeting, it became evident that every enthusiast group and concerned citizen felt that that narrow concept was outdated, and a broader more inclusive definition for the strategy was needed. After much discussion, it was settled that a “Recreation Travel Strategy” was what the group was working on, which included the following information.

Who is it for? What should be considered?

When we asked what people or views must be considered when designing a strategy, this is what we heard:

Belief that the strategy should include every interest group

- Everyone’s.
- The users of the public lands
- Affecting recreational users other than motorized users. There needs to be acknowledgement that distance between non-motorized and motorized is the key to the degree of conflict. Example: Hiker needs to be farther away to gain solitude from motorized noise versus a motorized user trying to get away from a non-motorized user.
- Everyone, but please do NOT forget that this strategy must incorporate the ecological needs of wildlife, soils, water quality, flora.
- Sharing, inclusiveness, reducing peak conflicts, but not to extreme demands
- Equal freedom for all users. Land should not be closed or designated wilderness because lynx or other threatened species (not native to our area) are introduced to our area. Public land cannot be closed in this fashion.
- Local economy should not be excluded from any decision.
- The communities represented by the user groups and recent IAC surveys regarding this very issue.
- All agencies to participate
- All users need to be educated about each others needs and problems. All user groups can work together.
- The safety of all users and all their individual uses
- 4x4 users, other OHV users, non motorized users, environmentalists
- Local landowners and businesses and the users the trail was historically built for.
- USFS—provide diverse opportunities to all user groups. Avoid making our forests roadless!!! The rest of us deserve an opportunity, not all of us just wish to hike.

Belief that the strategy should include locals and residents

- Local residents
- Private land owners
- Landowners
- The people that live here and want to use our woods for all types of recreation

Belief that strategy should included motorized users

- Snowmobile use
- The motorized users are the key people involved. Their view should be considered.
- Motorized users
- Use the roads we have for 4x4 four-wheelers
- This land is ours as American citizens. I want to use it in a wise manner. I feel the prejudice against motorized access is unwarranted and tends to be negative. We enjoy the beautiful land and use our machines as a way to see it. Not destroy or harm it in any way.
- Keeping user groups (single track, ATV, 4-wheel drive) in their own special groups
- Leave single track alone, 20 years of single track don't change a thing!
- ORVs because all other users are considered more important

Belief that strategy should include non-motorized users and other concerns

- Non-motor users
- Keep the trails for horses and walkers
- Noise
- Wildlife
- Education, respect, and compassion for TES
- Biological data
- Environment impact
- Areas should not be closed because of a transplanted animal. Example: lynx or caribou.
- Older people need not be shoved aside for the younger more able-bodied types. I like to walk with my dog. Are dogs allowed?
- Disabled
- County road maintenance (snowplows)
- Those views of individuals who either continue with the increasingly difficult task of finding what they are looking for on the forest, as well as those who have given up

Belief that the strategy should be done by the Forest Service

- Forest Service need to spend more time managing the forest and less time trying to control the people that pay their salary.

- You are paid by us, you work for us. We will not let it happen. The area you are speaking of has no bad effects if more areas are made and opened up.

Transition from talking about the problems to solving the problems

The fourth, fifth and sixth meetings were spent discussing the specific suggestions and ideas for addressing the issues outlined in the first three meeting. This process was called identifying System Improvements. We used the same issue statements identified in the earlier meetings, and used them as organization concepts that kept the group on track.

You will notice that like ideas were clumped together under a heading to better organize the extensive information that we received. Each of these statements could be considered a **basic premise** of that issue that needs to be solved. This concept of collecting like ideas or basic premise will become important later. If you do not agree with the way ideas are collected, or the label that was attached to them, please let us know.

This is the main meat of the strategy. Everything that has been outlined as the strategy comes from this section.

System Improvements

1. **No clear understanding or communication of current regulations and policies: don't know where it's legal to ride, don't know when others are breaking the rules, get different message from the agency, rules seem to change in mid-stream.**

Written Information about regulations

- FS needs to develop bullet list...put into card form available to public and FS employees/law enforcement/front desk...distribute with annual permit (ie California).
- FS develops "Rules of use" card or pamphlet.
- Procedures manual...more detailed than bullet list. ROG++
- Bullet list of essential regulations—by area (forest, etc.)
- Maps and booklets of user regulations need to be available at ATV/snowmobiling stores, sports and hunting stores, etc.

Regulations

- Change or address state/county laws to accommodate quads and other ATVs on roads. (ie Idaho).
- Washington State needs ATV license—sell licenses to pay for signs, pamphlets, etc.
- Be able to get access from FS or DNR on rules and regulations, also to have some consistent regulations from area to area.

Digital Information about regulations

- Put info on internet with links.
- Encourage responsible use.

Information Available on regulations

- Get rules pamphlet with annual permit.
- Develop information kiosk at major entry points.
- Establish advisory group on Forest specific to recreational travel.
- Pamphlets and maps should be available in multiple places (public).
- Offices need to be open on weekends and recreation personnel should work on weekends.
- Maps and booklet of user regulations need to be available at DMV locations so that when one registers their vehicles, they get this information.
- Keep front desk folks informed and up to speed with maps, pamphlets, etc.
- Incumbent on users to know the regulations.
- Make sure Recreation Opportunity Guides are updates.
- Both FS employees and users need to know regulations.
- Regulations in green rigs for employee so employees can hand out proper information to users.

Maps that show regulations

- Put on Forest maps and pamphlets

Signs

- Signs with emblems on where can/can't ride (on each road).
 - Use the international signs!
- Less signs, not more signs
- Have Colville tag to pay for signs/education, etc. like Inland Paper.
- Have a sign plan for the ranger district or forest so that user groups can help maintain the signs.
- A stiff federal law on people shooting at signs in the forest
- Signage is a critical issue.
 - Signs that talk about what's allowed and restricted
 - Have consistent sign standard across the whole forest so that people know why roads and trails are closed.
 - Signs that talk to user etiquette: "Who yields to whom?"
 - All signing must meet acceptable sign standards
 - Could place at "kiosk"

2. **Need to be assured of access for all users and interest groups. Need to provide for a particular activity or sport.**

Trail System Access and Design

- Need comprehensive loop system...(connectivity is the key).
- Need a trail “system” that ties it all together...not just loops. (Including trailheads and campgrounds).
- Look at linking communities and services within “system” analysis.
- Complete inventory.
- Trails need to be properly designed or redesigned and constructed or reconstructed to prevent soil and other resource damage
- Design for full range of opportunities and level of difficulty.
- Allow reasonable off-route use (300 ft) to access...whatever (campsite, wood, etc).
- Do not build more roads.
- Areas to ride legally within the camping areas to access areas

Interest Group Access

- Need easier method for coordination between FS and volunteer groups (Volunteer Coordinator)
- FS needs to prioritize projects for volunteer work.
- Consider “hours” of quality experience, not just “miles.”

Access Signing

- Trail and road numbers need to match on ground and map
- Trail numbers and road numbers need to match map road and trail numbers and allowable uses for each trail number.
- Look at using closed roads for beginners where it fits into the “system” and links trails.

Cross County Travel

- Eliminate cross-country travel except where appropriate.
- Curtail use that results in development of a new route irregardless of type of user (stop user-created trails).

3. Need for information and education.

Information about expectations

- FS should have brochures at motorized and non-motorized events/trade shows/club rides/schools/dealerships... (Montana).
- Federal agency should require school with license (ATV and motorcycle)—similar to safe hunters course.
- Address age limits/classification in line with industry guidelines or skill levels (size, weight, etc).
- User group designations or maps for 2-wheelers, quads, snowmobiles etc. also user level designations for trails: i.e. beginner, intermediate, advanced.

Information about maps

- GPS coordinates for trailheads and features...include UTM grids on map.
- User group designations on the trail system maps and levels of difficulty.
- Establish volunteer host patrol system (provide FS radios). Sierra NF ex.

Information about volunteering

- Oregon system has examples—what level would this be addressed, est. by state enforced by feds.
- Maps and match road numbers and trail numbers to map numbers.
- Forest Service should have brochures and racing events, cross country events, trade shows, club rides, dealerships and at schools (Smokey the Bear type education).

Digital Information

- Less print information and more web-based information

Information Availability

- FS needs to go to more user groups with user maps and information

Education about effects of activities

- FS needs to educate user groups about the ecological impacts and damage inflicted by their specific usage/recreation
- FS needs to go to user groups to explain consequences of illegal usage of areas that are designated as close to motorized use.

4. Need for user ethics: sharing of users, conflicts with user groups, conflicts with other user groups.

Responsible user activities

- Keep It Simple Stupid (KISS)
- Stay on designated trails.
- Monitoring to document conflicts and damage. Need data to support opinions. Maybe users can help with keeping track and reporting problems.
- Document actual use—fill out trailhead.
- Non motorized users need to understand that motorized users have just as much right to be on National Forest
- Tread lightly—AND “on the right trail.”
- Yield concept (how to do it to)
- Speed limits for designated areas (use trail designs to obtain compliance)
- Noise—establish sound enforcement (either add noise or delete)
- User groups to correct damaged areas and pioneered trails/routes.
- Licensed ORV users and registered ORVs.
- Minimum age limit for motorized users.

- Motorized users need to understand and accept that their recreational use and activities are infringing upon non-motorized user experience and need to understand that space is needed to provide for the serenity, tranquility that non-motorized users seek. Noise and air pollution from their motors negatively affect non-motorized user groups.

Information to improve ethical behavior

- Idaho has ethics brochure. Pete will get Esther too.
- Provide info to set expectations.
- Direct user to areas that will meet expectation

Signs to reduce conflicts

- Signage as always
- Signage: full spectrum.
 - Triangle yield signs, pamphlets, maps.
 - Restricted uses.
 - Allowed uses.

Responsible management activities

- Monitoring to document conflicts
- Monitor usage (now cases are damage anecdotal)
- Build and maintain trails to specifications.
- Trail design to obtain desired behavior.
- Specific users need specific accessibility
- Build and maintain trails to standards, use groups to obtain, remove pioneered (user-created) trails.
- Dangerous areas, blind spots, mark and enforce.
- Sign-in box convenient.
- Eliminate cross-country travel except in designated areas.
- Speed limit, except for race areas.

5. Ability of the Forest Service to manage recreation: not enough money, doesn't fix facilities, doesn't address safety concerns, doesn't fix resource damage, doesn't enforce regulations and rules that exist.

Funding for program from the Forest Service (appropriated money from Congress)

- Budget: FS should allocate money from the State
- All users should equally pay, not just those requiring permits, need top support FS funding
- FS should commit regular money to recreation. Now is 4% of budget. This should increase to supplement.
- FS aggressively protect/enhance its share of federal budget

- “Not enough money”: how specifically are the fees now used? Nay way to change how they are used?
- Resources: funding and enforcements—these affect safety for users and impacts to the environment
- It doesn’t cost anything for a trail to exist—to maintain or improve does cost money
- Funding: make a direct connection between level of use permitted and level of funding available
- Find a way to fund FS the way it should be! Reprogram funding to achieve results.
- IF the public lobbies for money from Congress, they should know what they are asking for—be informed.
 - Keep pressure

Funding for program from external sources

- User fees—support of all who use the Forest. Ex: BLM has dispersed camping permits.
- User fees above tax base—(it’s all our heritage, but scale costs.)
- Have general recreation license
- Do not establish tax system
- Ask for more money from federal government
- User fee for dispersed camping
- FS should lobby the federal government for more recreation management dollars for trail maintenance, education, signage, enforcement, etc
- Get user groups of different forms of activities to maintain and take care of trails and areas.
- Funding: how do people (groups) find out about grants?
- Charge fee for maps. Have the maps with correct information and regulations

Enforcement of program

- Enforcement:
 - Focus on problem areas
 - Be where the users are
 - Should have the court system utilize community service for offenders: it will mean more than just a fine.
- FS should implement something similar to the hunter education programs: feature a manual on proper handling/use that is written/edited by the users. The information will be passed around by the users if there is this partnership.
 - Ex: Motorcycle safety is taught at the community college
- Police each other
- Does FS have to be involved in enforcement?
- Enforcement: if you don’t have money to enforce level of usage, usage levels need to be restricted.
- Signing of closures should include reason
- When purchasing a pass, emphasize education or regulations

- FS less money to police and educate the users
- License for ATV and other motorized users
- Emphasize problem areas.
- Make examples of violators
- Bigger fines and stricter enforcements
- Require licensing
- Signs need to be maintained to indicated the appropriate use, status of who it's open to and for what reason.
- Require training for new owners for motorized users
- Have blood alcohol standards
- To obtain a permit for any area, you should have to go through an education process first to obtain your pass, so you know what and how you can use the forest!
- FS doesn't have resources to solve enforcement problem—need to find way (users do) to police...don't put all onus of responsibility on FS
- Should have age limit to ATV use. Limit of 18 unless supervised by adult. Or must have drivers license unless supervised by adult. Who mandates this—the FS?
- Have 1-800# to report violators
- Use volunteers for enforcement
- Instead of a fine for damage—community service to fix and appreciate area.

Decision Making

- Planning and decision making should be based on scientific integrity and defensibility
- Complete route analysis, or limit existing use knowing that another step is coming
- Planning and decision making must meet all laws and regulations, ie Forest Plan, clean water act, clean air act, ESA, NEPA, NFMA, APA, EO, for the protection and recovery of resources.

Media coverage of program

- Have positive vs. negative media input
- Examine role of FS...if this has changed, communicate it. (Example—away from timber, towards recreation). This will help users identify if lobby group is needed, etc.
- FS needs to communicate positive info to press, etc. Extension approach.
- Only a few people are the ones causing trouble
- Positive education articles.
- Provide positive and informative articles to the Spokesman Review regarding snowmobile and ATV uses and issues rather than the negative articles on these forest users. Honey is more effective than vinegar
- Awareness and responsibility of agency

Volunteer programs

- Do X amount of work (hours) to get pass free.
- Develop easier method for volunteer groups to coordinate with FS personnel.
- Forest Service needs to prioritize projects for volunteer labor.
- Meet with user groups on an annual basis, to talk about rules, etc.
- Education: not just ATV users, but all user groups need to understand regulations.
- Volunteers need specifics to support each need.
- Cost share agreement with each group.
- Work with clubs—Mountaineers, Winter Knights, Backcountry Horsemen
- Need larger license tags, or enforcement may not work well.

Management approach by Forest Service

- Problems are the “renegades” who don’t come to meetings like this—how can we regulate them if they don’t “care”?
- Recreation folks should work weekends, holidays
- Train FS staff in ORV management, work with ORV folks to understand trail requirements
- Need to have roads and trails closures inventoried so that people can know why they are closed or open. There is supposed to be a Roads analysis done, why isn’t the forest using that tool?
- Have to balance use with funding for monitoring, enforcement, maintenance.
- Operate all NF as closed to motorized use unless marked open. Wenatchee NF is operating this way according to Executive Order 11989 and 11644.
- Safety of users and ecosystem resources: There needs to be direct correlation between funding levels and specific use levels.
- FS be proactive –attend user group meetings, give presentations
- Work with clubs, dealerships
- Meet with user group organizations annually to discuss pertinent issues
- Use dealerships to get FS message out
- Duty officer on Saturdays and Sundays at visitor centers at national forest
- Develop a manual for use on FS trails (coordinate user groups with FS) Meet annually to discuss/change/adapt
- Websites for each region (or each national forest) which to include topography maps.
- Close the CNF to overland travel
- Ability to rent from USFS, satellite telephones...user pays for any emergency calls and for daily rental of the phone
- FS open on weekends and holidays!
- Outreach to renegades
- Management must be legally compliant
- Lack of development of guiding principles that will guide trail and land use designation

Education

- Education: improved maps, also take time to contact user groups at their meeting place, inform user groups of what is legal for use in that area
- Enforcement: signage when there is a problem with a user group and what problem is! Rules posted at trailheads.
- Greater education on recreational impacts/effects on wildlife and ecology via kiosks and places where recreation users buy their passes, equipment.

6. Concerns about the economy and tourism, with or without any particular user group.

Understanding tourism

- FS needs to conduct study/research to determine accurate usage numbers and what users spend in CNF. Include economic analysis and work with businesses to learn how to capture trail user money.
- Tourist money is lost because Idaho has different ATV regulations than WA—need licensing change.
- What do local communities want? Economy development and money or keep ‘rural,’ local, less people, etc.
- FS and users have to follow rules or will have conflicts—lead to loss of tourist dollars.
- With more information, it will help businesses, users, and the Forest
- Incorporate Recreation and Tourism Strategy meeting.

Increasing tourism

- Need to get communities to realize potential of recreation areas and work with businesses to encourage use/develop economy
- Recreation from motorized tourism brings in more money than non-motorized (gas, supplies, food, tools,)
- Need to maximize opportunity for all user groups, which will then maximize tourism and economic benefit. If we maximize the experience for one group at the expense of other user groups, this will be counter-productive to increased tourism.
- Population is increasing—have to maximize opportunity, which will not maximize experience.
- Co-sponsor the Selkirk Loop Bike Tour for 2004 to bring road cyclist enthusiasts to region

Digital tourism

- Put out professional website—look in to cost-sharing with businesses
- Website for recreation use, communication, and local tourism to maximize opportunities
- Robust and professional web sites
- Website info, make it accessible at businesses

Forest Service's role in tourism

- FS needs to incorporate recreation strategy meetings—disappointed that the business folks are not at these meetings.
- FS should work with legislators on licensing issues, will keep funds here.
- FS should target marketing to user groups to attract to the area: ex, websites, email, etc. Market to photo groups, hikers, ATV users, etc. Be creative. Use state websites, REI (ex).
- Make FS info available via public and private enterprises. ie brochures, maps, conditions of trails, etc.
- Have FS information (maps, closures, regulations) available at local businesses. FS should work with local businesses in marketing opportunities: provide maps, info trail updates, etc.
- Get accurate user type and count
- Help local businesses learn how to take advantage of FS recreation opportunities Forest should have more publicity of available, desirable areas.
- Make FS information available via public and private enterprises (ie brochures, maps, current trail information). At recreation businesses, motel/restaurants, chamber of commerce
- Umatilla Forest: ATV trail system with maps, markers, bridges, campgrounds, etc. Think about adopting similar system.
- CNF—allocate money, incorporate recreation and tourism strategy meeting. Include people concerned with quality of life and ecological impacts.
- Forest should take the approach of making recreation areas desirable to the group that they might interest. They will use the place if it interests them.
 - Proper placement of recreation activities: put it in the “right” place and sign properly and then market.

Tourism marketing

- Accurate use of trails, proper use on the proper trails
- Work with business in area to market.
- Pressure, brought by user groups, on the state legislature, to bring on a container deposit law in the state of WA (a beverage container deposit law).
- These meetings would benefit from making this sort of statement in the beginning. Collaborative group participants should be reminded that there are forest users that are not represented directly at meetings: wildlife.
- Targeted marketing to potential user groups: wildlife viewers, motorized users, hikers, hunters, etc.
- Land-use designation: no worthwhile info provided and people can't tell where they should go to do the things they want to do.
- Should encourage more reasonable forest use.
- Lands should be designated multi-use when possible and signed that way
- Please leave the non-motorized areas and the motorized use as much alone as possible
- Target marketing of user group to public

- Roads on FS in Washington state require vehicle license even for rough 4WD roads.
- Northeast Washington has edge in un-crowded outdoor recreation opportunities (this is an advantage in drawing business and educated skilled workers.
- Local attitude might be to keep out outsiders
- Horse manure at trailhead offends urban users!
- Work with local businesses to develop recreation opportunities and marketing.
- Develop a trail around Pend Oreille River.
- Targeted marketing to user interest/class/activity: links to user group web sites
- Creation of a good motorized system could help protect the wildlife habitat and if motorize use requires licenses, fees, etc. This could also be a funding resource for wildlife habitat and motorize use.
- Continue to allocate funds to economic diversification, ie tourism and recreation
- Promote the Selkirk/Kettle Range as an ecological asset

7. Need for compromise: Need for better communication, need for multi-use trails that are only non-motorized, need for non-motorized users to accept motorized use.

Need for understanding each other's interests

- Education: need to *know* where recreation areas are in order to better compromise.
- Expectations of users: can lead to disappointment—users need to change expectations, or condition themselves to expect multi use, etc.
- Mutual acceptance
 - Size of space: non-motorized users need more space for ‘tranquility,’ etc.
 - Motorized users need more miles cause they can cover more distance.
- “Work party facilitation meetings”
- FS should promote joint work parties to promote joint understanding...also serve as clearing house to facilitate group work parties
- FS needs to conduct/contract courses so others understand budget process, NEPA, etc.
- Motorized users understand non-motorized needs and vice-versa.
- Compromise between user groups:
 - speed is a safety issue for all users
 - need more understanding of safety issues and compromise
- Education on areas available for non-motorized and motorized trails so both can be happy using appropriate trails
- Joint work parties with diverse user groups represented
- Increased population=more forest users=need for more compromise.

- Need to educate non-motorized users that one encounter with a motorized user does not ruin their experience.
- Lower expectations! Not for non-motorized users, but for motorized users. Don't they expect to be limited to parking areas.
- Too many people, if not now, in the future. The cooperation between user groups will be more and more necessary.
- Safety is paramount between user groups
- Advisory committee
- Non-motorized users need to recognize that some handicapped people may need to use motorized means to be able to access areas that they otherwise may not have a chance to see.
- There is a certain threshold in which non-motorized users cannot accept motorized use. For me it is the illegal entries into non-motorized user areas and recklessness of numerous motorized users destroying ecological resources (mud bogging) and disrupting the serenity and tranquility that non-motorized users seek. Furthermore motorized users need to understand and accept that their recreation activities are infringing on the non-motorized user experience and that solitude because noise and exhaust from motorized users can be heard and smelt from a much farther distance.
- It is much easier for motorized users to "cooperate" with each other. It basically boils down to getting around each other when they meet, after they cooperate with the passing, they are happily on their way. However, with solitude-seekers (hikers, snow-shoers, skiers) the noise and smell of fumes is constant on a busy day.
- Needs to be a set of guidelines or principles agreed upon between motorized and non-motorized users
- Trail maintenance with input and work from all possible user varieties to promote joint understanding of each user's needs.

Limitations of compromise

- Motorized users "lose" when compromise is suggested. They are getting tired of losing. FS can't pick on just one group.
- Work toward compromise but don't expect it in all instances...there are areas in which compromise is not possible.
- No compromise: between motorized trails and non-motorized trails. This is easy to understand.

Multiple use area

- Lots of safety issues when running multiple uses on one trail
- Joint use in most cases can be compatible
- Some combined trails OK but if all combined motorized tend to having motorized and non-motorized together like putting a kindergarten kid to play football with NFL team.
- Please sign every multi-use trail with use types and rules for use. Please create maps and rules clearly posted at trailheads.

Priority use area

- Hunters need designated areas. Also need to retrieve game with ATVs—perhaps could purchase a special use permit for that reason.
- Allow handicapped areas for ATV riding—slower speeds, etc
- Open up cross country trails to 4-wheelers during summer
- Users *want* to be sensitive to other user groups, therefore we may need to separate areas to allow for that. If trail is multi-use but not designed well for it, neither user group will have fun in the area. For example, hikers and ATV users can be compared to kindergarteners playing with football players. One group is afraid of getting hurt, the other afraid of hurting.
- Restrictions against cross country travel
- Provide for solitude for users, especially from motorized use.
- FS should adopt a closed unless open policy.
- Separate trails and areas are necessary for some users (horsemen and hikers) to enjoy their recreation time
- Again CNF needs to operate their trail and road system as “closed unless marked open” via EO 11644 and 11989

Forest Service role in cooperative effort

- FS should establish an Advisory Group
- Forest needs to manage *all* recreation use: if so, budget will increase, support will increase, and will be more positive
- Info on how to share trails to be posted both at trailhead and along the trail
- Recreational trail use advisory board to the Forest Service
- FS clearing house for interaction between recreation groups.
- Being to actively manage all recreation use

Safety

- Safety: Speed and the bigger better faster more mentality can cause huge problems
- Separate trails in areas for non-compatible users to reduce accidents/collisions

8. Concerns about all use and how it affects the environment.

Forest Service role in determining effects to the environment

- FS should manage use:
 - Use photo monitoring
 - Manage cross-country use
- *Any* use has impact on environment. FS needs to stimulate change where/when it needs to be done.
- What about damage from cattle?

- Monitor the same place over a long time. If the Forest actually knew what was going on with damage, they might have a leg to stand on when it came to closing something down.
- Wildlife as a user group—need greater recognition of this.
- Monitor impact of ORV use—use photos, videos.
- Monitor impact of hikers use – use data to support closures.

Forest Service role in protecting the environment

- Our needs are secondary to native needs: wildlife, nature.
- Spread of noxious weeds is a concern
- Impacts analysis and decision making of recreation needs to be based on:
 - Laws
 - Scientific integrity
 - Ecological carrying capacity
- Some areas are too sensitive—therefore those areas can cater only to certain groups.
- Registration/reservation for use—others could then see what level of use to expect

Role of education in protecting the environment

- Promote “leave no trace” to all groups at all locations
- Train to be environmentally friendly
- Tours to damaged areas. Tours to controlled areas. (for education purpose)
- Educate recreation users on how fragile or not the areas is and on how the area is to be used!

Who is to blame for environmental degradation?

- Environmental degradation is not restricted to one user group
- Everyone wants to blame someone else. It’s everyone’s problem.
- Curtail cross country use of motorized, or any use that creates trail—manage use!
- Designated recreation areas should be based on ecological impacts to that area.
-
- The affect of use on environment is not contraindicated for use when managed appropriately

Physical changes to protect the environment

- Reservation system: registration when you are in the forest, like a flight plan.
 - Mandatory/non-mandatory
- FS manual trash compactors in various areas
- Trash: empty containers law as in Oregon—will entice people to pack it in, pack it out to collect deposit
- Dumpsters: locate in recreation areas, perhaps invent one with a manual wheel compaction system

- Support multi-use trails: *design* of trail and trailhead is important to meet/exceed design/use expectations.
- Larger use area for motorized vehicle use will avoid one area being used up or overused.
- Design of trails and other locations to meet or exceed designated use. Support multi-use.
- “Disperse rather than shrink area” –Amen!
- Build trails to accommodate the use intended
- Proper design for trail heads and track so any trails...will meet all uses.
- Open more areas for multi-use

Managerial changes to protect the environment

- Design of trails for designated uses and management areas
- FS needs change in increased management
- FS needs to put more money toward increased management to keep down negative affects of the environment
- Management of recreation trails should make threatened and endangered species a top concern.
- Promote leave no trace philosophy!
- Designate the acceptable use within each area based on ecological impacts. Restrict each use to designated trail and areas. Prohibit those uses outside of designated areas. “Closed if not signed open!”
- Spread of noxious weeds is a problem
- Decision making and planning must be based on scientific integrity and defensibility and ecological carrying capacity to protect resource damage
- Decision making and planning must be legally binding to NEPA, ESA, Forest Plan, CWA, NFMA, FSH, EO etc,
- Use registered hay
- All users to remove their feces
- Prohibit cattle grazing
- Need to develop much greater understanding of how motorized use (and even non-motorized use) affects wildlife: prey species, predators, etc, and their habitat.
- Our needs to use motorized vehicles in the forest must ultimately be acknowledge as secondary to wildlife needs. Our needs are in the context of “leisure time” while wildlife’s needs are in the context of home, habitat, roaming, breeding, and feeding needs.
- To see some form of permit or way for elderly and handicapped to get into some areas that are now closed to get game from walk in areas.
- Tearing up the landscape, defacing. To broad the effect for that special interest.
- Let’s not lose trails! Shrinking will only cause more impact on main trails
- Design trail for the intended use! Horse, ATV, etc
- Better separation of hikers and motorized vehicles.
- Some trails not appropriate for motorized vehicles

- Designated ORV areas should be based on ecological impacts and effects on non-motorized users and wildlife.
- Close areas that are impacted by ORV use or other recreational trail use.
- Require ORV vehicle licenses. Post ORV speed limit on mixed use trails.
- Close pioneered trails and repair damage
- Prohibit pioneering of trails and roads and have sufficient penalties to deter use. Require violators to repair damage.
- There needs to be direct relationship between funding levels and specific use levels. That way negative resource compaction can be monitored and mitigated and maintained.

Transition from Issues and Concerns to Solutions and a Strategy

After the lengthy and through discussion of all of the issues and concerns and the system improvement to correct the situation, the Colville National Forest is in a better position to understand recreation travel on the forest. To take this information and convert it into a strategy, the forest simply took the issue statements and converted them into a goal statement.

For example: **Issue Statement One**

No clear understanding or communication of current regulations and policies: don't know where it's legal to ride, don't know when others are breaking the rules, get different message from the agency, rules seem to change in mid-stream.

Has been turned into **Goal Statement One**

1) Clear communication of regulations and policy

Each issue statement has a resulting goal statement. It takes the basic premise behind the issue and turns it into a positive proactive goal statement that is the basis for a Recreation Travel Strategy.

Under each of the Issues Statements, there is a set of **basic premises** that is associated with that issue. Collecting like ideas that solved problems created these basic premises. These basic premises need to be included in a strategy that would solve the issues. To do this, they were converted from a premise into an **objective statement** under each of the goals.

For example, as found on page 17:

Written Information about regulations

- FS needs to develop bullet list...put into card form available to public and FS employees/law enforcement/front desk...distribute with annual permit (ie California).
- FS develops "Rules of use" card or pamphlet.
- Procedures manual...more detailed than bullet list. ROG++
- Bullet list of essential regulations—by area (forest, etc.)

The italicized statement has been turned into the **objective statement** indicated by a number such as:

- 1) Work with interested parties to create written information about regulations and policy.**

Each of the bullet statement found above need to be captured to as ideas for meeting the objective and goal. Remember, each of these statements have come from participants in the process. In order to honor the energy and effort that has gone into participating in this process, these statements were converted into **potential action items**.

The bulleted statements have been turned into the following **potential action items** indicated by a letter such as:

- a. Develop bullet list of essential regulations.**
- b. Develop procedures manual.**
- c. Develop rules of use by type of user.**

As you can see by the above example, four system improvement suggestions have turned into three action items. This may occur as ideas are condensed or interpreted by the Forest Service. The role of the group is to check and see if this interpretation is correct and true to the nature of the suggestion as it was intended.

Because of the magnitude of information that we received from the group to solve issues in Recreation Travel, a spread sheet was created to track all of the ideas one at a time, and where they fit into the strategy. This spread sheet is essential to tracking each of the goals, the associated objectives, and the resulting potential action items. The spreadsheet is a tool that the group can use to further delineate the feasibility of any given action item. It is evident by using the spreadsheet which potential action items are feasible for the Forest Service and user groups to tackle. To maintain the integrity of the information gathering process, the Forest Service wanted to continue to display potential action item that are infeasible due to the fact that it is outside the FS domain to “solve.”

The following is the RECREATION TRAVEL STRATEGY with its goals and objectives outlined, including some of the potential action items. Of course, in the future, the list of action items will increase or decrease as things are completed, or new ideas are created.

GOALS of a Recreation Travel Strategy

- 1) Clear communication of regulations and policy**
- 2) Assure opportunities and access for interest groups**
- 3) Inform and educate**
- 4) Foster responsible-use ethic among public land users**
- 5) Manage recreation**
- 6) Foster tourism and local economy**
- 7) Facilitate communication with and between user groups**
- 8) Protect the environment**

GOAL 1 – Clear communication of regulations and policy

Objectives of the goal:

- 2) Work with interested parties to create written information about regulations and policy
 - a. Develop bullet list of essential regulations.
 - b. Develop procedures manual.
 - c. Develop rules of use by type of user.
- 3) Pursue regulation changes to make the legal requirements clear and understandable.
 - a. Address state and county laws to accommodate quads on roadways.
 - b. Address Washington State ATV license.
 - c. Address consistency of regulations between riding areas.
- 4) Pursue avenues of getting information disseminated about rules, regulations, and policy to the appropriate user groups.
 - a. Develop internet information with links.
 - b. FS and DNR office provide space and time.
 - c. Annual permit includes rules.
 - d. Dept. of Motor Vehicles office provides with vehicle registration.
 - e. Create Agency entry point kiosks.
 - f. All FS employees have info available.
 - g. Available in FS vehicles.
 - h. On FS maps and pamphlets.
 - i. Dealerships that sell quads, snowmobiles, hunting stores, sporting goods provide info.
 - j. FS offices open on weekends.
 - k. FS people working on weekends.
 - l. Safety brochures developed for all user groups.
 - m. Information brochures developed for all user groups.

- n. Sign program for summer and winter recreation sites.
- o. Signs with emblems on where can/can't ride (on each road).
 - I. Use the international signs!
 - II. Minimize the number of signs. Locate near trailheads to minimize effect of "sign pollution."
 - III. Have Colville tag to pay for signs/education, etc. like Inland Paper.
 - IV. Have a sign plan for the ranger district or forest so that user groups can help maintain the signs.
 - V. A stiff federal law on people shooting at signs in the forest
 - VI. Signs that talk about what is allowed and restricted
 - VII. Have consistent sign standard across the whole forest so that people know why roads and trails are closed.
 - VIII. Signs that talk to user etiquette: "Who yields to whom?"
 - IX. All signing must meet acceptable sign standards.

GOAL 2 – Assure opportunities and access for all interest groups

Objectives of the goal:

- 1) Determine if trail system access and design characteristics are adequate for a variety of users. Work with specific user groups to determine proposals for change.
 - a. Create comprehensive system that ties riding areas together (including trailheads and campgrounds). Inventory and address easement and access issues to ensure cohesive trail system.
 - b. Link communities and services within "system" analysis. Determine if there are areas to ride legally within a campground to access campsite and riding area. Determine what facilities on the forest need connected to trail systems. Emphasize those areas to that type of use. In other areas where you don't want that type of use, tell people why, and where they should go if they want to use that type of equipment.
Complete inventory.
 - c. Trails need to be properly designed or redesigned and constructed or reconstructed to prevent soil and other resource damage.
 - d. Do an analysis of opportunities available by user group. Design for full range of opportunities and level of difficulty. Consider hours of available opportunity, not just miles.
 - e. Determine reasonable off-route use (300 ft) to access...whatever (campsite, wood, etc).
 - f. Minimize roads that chop up systems.
- 2) Coordinate volunteer efforts.
 - a. Create Volunteer Coordinator position to work with the public.
 - b. FS needs to prioritize projects for volunteer work.
- 3) Create sign plan which displays effect to access management.

- 4) Determine appropriate distribution and available mileage of recreation travel routes to meet current and future needs. Determine this through use of a user group forum.

GOAL 3 – Inform and educate

Objectives of the goal

- 1) Seek to inform users about an area so that they can set appropriate expectations when they recreationally travel in the area. Clearly define policy, management direction, and regulations that constrain recreation activity.
 - a. FS should have brochures at motorized and non-motorized events/trade shows/club rides/schools/dealerships... (Montana).
 - b. Federal agency should require school with license (ATV and motorcycle)—similar to safe hunters course.
 - c. Address age limits/classification in line with industry guidelines or skill levels (size, weight, etc).
 - d. Create user group designations for 2-wheelers, quads, snowmobiles, mountain biking, hiking, horseback etc. AND user level designations for trails: beginner, intermediate, advanced.
- 2) Create maps that display pertinent information. Work with “advisory group” to create the maps.
 - a. GPS coordinates for trailheads and features...include UTM grids on map.
 - b. Map user group designations on the trail system maps and levels of difficulty.
- 3) Provide information to involved users on how they can participate, get involved, or volunteer in the area they are recreating.
 - a. Oregon system has examples—what level would this be addressed, est. by state enforced by feds.
 - b. Maps and match road numbers and trail numbers to map numbers.
 - c. Forest Service should have brochures and racing events, cross country events, trade shows, club rides, dealerships and at schools (Smokey the Bear type education).
 - d. Establish volunteer host patrol system (provide FS radios)
 - e. Provide information and education on the web.
- 4) Educate on the effects of undesirable behavior. Use *Leave No Trace* program.
 - a. FS needs to educate user groups about the ecological impacts and damage inflicted by their specific usage/recreation.
 - b. FS needs to go to user groups to explain consequences of illegal usage of areas that are designated as closed to motorized use.

GOAL 4 - Foster responsible-use ethic among public land users

Objectives of the goal

- 1) Work with “advisory group” to produce list of responsible user attributes to promote on the CNF.
 - a. Use Keep It Simple Stupid (KISS) principle for public outreach.
 - b. Make recommendations to stay on designated trails.
 - c. Monitor to document conflicts and damage. Collect data to support opinions. Have system so that users keep track and report problems.
 - d. Document actual use—inform users why they should fill out trailhead registration. Make sign-in boxes convenient.
 - e. Non motorized users need to understand that motorized users have just as much right to be on National Forest.
 - f. Motorized users need to understand that non-motorized users have just as much right to be on National Forest.
 - g. Promote Tread Lightly—AND “on the right trail.”
 - h. Promote “Yield” concept and education on how to do it.
 - i. Create speed limits for designated areas (use trail designs to obtain compliance)
 - j. Establish sound thresholds and do enforcement.
 - k. Create system where user groups correct damaged areas and pioneered trails/routes.
 - l. Ensure that OHV’s are licensed and registered.
 - m. Create minimum age limit for motorized users.
 - n. Motorized users need to understand and accept that their recreational use and activities are infringing upon non-motorized user experience and need to understand that space is needed to provide for the serenity, tranquility that non-motorized users seek. Noise and air pollution from their motors negatively affect non-motorized user groups.
- 2) Provide information about regulations, penalties, and consequences for irresponsible behavior and potential impacts to resources from inappropriate use and the subsequent loss of use areas.
 - a. Create Washington ethics brochure.
 - b. Provide info to set expectations.
 - c. Direct users to areas that will meet expectations.
 - d. Expand the Colville’s efforts with Tread Lightly! And Leave No Trace national ethics development organizations
 - e. Create sign program to reduce conflicts and set expectations of the recreation travel in the area.
- 3) Foster and support volunteer opportunities and groups that emphasize responsible use. Improve public outreach program for visitors to instill and strengthen responsible-use ethic.
 - a. Create recognition for user groups that work hard at improving responsible use.
 - b. Pay to send volunteers to Leave No Trace training programs (scholarships).
 - c. Make presentations at user group meetings that demonstrate expectations about responsible use.

- 4) Create a monitoring program that will address recreation travel.
 - a. Monitoring to document conflicts
 - b. Monitor damage, correction of damage, effects of concentration, effects of dispersal.
 - c. Make sure trail design creates the desired behavior.
 - d. Monitor effects to changing specific accessibility to certain users.
 - e. Dangerous areas, blind spots, mark and enforce.

GOAL 5 - Manage recreation

Objectives of the goal

- 1) Aggressively address funding issues for this program on the Colville NF.
 - a. FS aggressively protect/enhance its share of federal budget.
 - b. Seek ways for all users to pay equally, not just those requiring permits.
 - c. FS should commit regular money to recreation. Now is 4% of budget. This should increase to supplement.
 - d. Show the public how fees are specifically being used. Create a feed-back loop so the public can help influence how the fees are being used.
 - e. Acknowledge that funding for enforcement affects safety for users and impacts to the environment
 - f. Acknowledge that it doesn't cost anything for a trail to exist—to maintain or improve does cost money.
 - g. Make a direct connection between level of use permitted and level of funding available.
 - h. Find a way to fund FS the way it should be. Reprogram funding to achieve results.
 - i. IF the public lobbies for money from Congress, they should know what they are asking for—be informed.
 - j. Address the fact that the public doesn't understand where funding for recreation programs come from, and how they are being spent.
- 2) Seek external funding opportunities with the help of partners and the “advisory group”.
 - a. Have a grant coordinator/writer on the forest that facilitates acquiring grants.
 - b. User fees above tax base—(it's all our heritage, but scale costs.)
 - c. Have general recreation license.
 - d. Do not establish tax system.
 - e. Collect user fees for dispersed camping.
 - f. FS should lobby the federal government for more recreation management dollars for trail maintenance, education, signage, enforcement, etc.
 - g. Get user groups of different forms of activities to maintain and take care of trails and areas.

- h. Help partners find out about grant opportunities, and write grants.
 - i. Charge a fee for maps. Have the maps with correct information and regulations
- 3) Create an enforcement program for recreation travel on the CNF. Seek information and feedback from the “advisory group.”
- a. Enforcement needs to focus on problem areas and be where the users are.
 - b. Have the court system utilize community service for offenders because it will mean more than just a fine.
 - c. FS should implement something similar to the hunter education programs: feature a manual on proper handling/use that is written/edited by the users. The users will pass around information if there is a partnership that created the information.
 - d. Police each other.
 - e. Determine the role the FS has being involved in enforcement.
 - f. If you don’t have money to enforce level of usage, restrict use levels.
 - g. Signing of closures should include reason
 - h. When purchasing a pass, emphasize education or regulations
 - i. FS should have less money to police and educate the users.
 - j. Make examples of violators with bigger fines and stricter enforcements
 - k. Require and enforce licensing.
 - l. Signs need to be maintained to indicate the appropriate use, status of who it’s open to and for what reason.
 - m. Require training for new owners for motorized users.
 - n. Have blood alcohol standards on trail and road systems.
 - o. To obtain a permit for any area, you should have to go through an education process first to obtain your pass, so you know what and how you can use the area.
 - p. FS doesn’t have resources to solve enforcement problem—need to find way (users do) to police...don’t put all onus of responsibility on FS
 - q. Should have age limit to ATV use. Limit of 18 unless supervised by adult. Or must have drivers license unless supervised by adult. Who mandates this—the FS?
 - r. Have 1-800# to report violators.
 - s. Need larger license tags because it is impossible to enforce with tiny numbers.
- 4) Planning and decisions on recreation travel project work will follow the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.
- a. Planning and decision-making should be based on scientific integrity and defensibility.
 - b. Complete route analysis, or limit existing use knowing that another step is coming.
 - c. Planning and decision-making must meet all laws and regulations, ie Forest Plan, clean water act, clean air act, Endangered Species Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and the National Forest Management Act for the protection and recovery of resources.
- 5) Seek to create positive media interaction on recreation travel efforts.

- a. Examine the role of FS has in recreation travel, if this has changed, communicate it. (Example—away from timber, towards recreation). This will help users identify if lobby group is needed, etc.
 - b. FS needs to communicate positive info to press.
 - c. Understand and communicate that only a few people are the ones causing trouble.
 - d. Positive education articles.
 - e. Provide positive and informative articles to the Spokesman Review regarding snowmobile and ATV uses and issues rather than the negative articles on these forest users. Honey is more effective than vinegar
 - f. Awareness and responsibility of agency to create positive image.
- 6) Create volunteer coordinator that will manage volunteers from a variety of interest groups.
- a. Create opportunity where a certain amount of work in hours will allow volunteers to get a pass for the work.
 - b. Develop easier method for volunteer groups to coordinate with FS personnel. Forest Service needs to prioritize projects for volunteer labor.
 - c. Meet with user groups on an annual basis, to talk about rules, etc.
 - d. Education is important for not only OHV users, but all user groups need to understand regulations.
 - e. Volunteers need specifics to support each need.
 - f. Cost share agreement will be done with each group.
 - g. Work with clubs—Mountaineers, Winter Knights, Backcountry Horsemen.
- 7) Address agency role in managing recreation travel on the CNF.
- a. Acknowledge that the real problems are the “renegades” who don’t come to meetings like this—create a plan so they can be regulated, even if they don’t go by the rules.
 - b. Recreation folks should work on weekends and holidays.
 - c. Train FS staff in OHV management and work with OHV folks to understand trail requirements
 - d. Need to have roads and trails closures inventoried so that people can know why they are closed or open. There is a Roads Analysis done, and the CNF should use that tool.
 - e. Operate all NF as closed to motorized use unless marked open.
 - f. Safety of users and ecosystem resources should have a direct correlation between funding levels and specific use levels.
 - g. FS be proactive –attend user group meetings, give presentations, work with clubs and dealerships. Meet with user group organizations annually to discuss pertinent issues
 - h. Saturdays and Sundays should have employees at visitor centers on National Forest
 - i. Websites for each region (or each national forest) which to include topography maps.
 - j. Close the CNF to overland travel

- k. Ability to rent from USFS, satellite telephones...user pays for any emergency calls and for daily rental of the phone.
 - l. Management must be legally compliant.
 - m. Lack of development of guiding principles that will guide trail and land use designation
- 8) Use information and education to manage recreation.
- a. Manage recreation by improving information, maps, and contacting user groups at their meeting place to inform user groups of what is legal for use in that area
 - b. Manage recreation by using enforcement and signs when there is a problem with a particular use. Post the rules at the trailheads.
 - c. Greater education on recreational impacts/effects on wildlife and ecology via kiosks and places where recreation users buy their passes, equipment.

GOAL 6 – Foster tourism and the local economy

Objectives of the goal

- 1) Gain understanding of tourism in the local economy.
 - a. FS needs to conduct study/research to determine accurate use numbers and what users spend in CNF. Include economic analysis and work with businesses to learn how to capture trail user money.
 - b. Acknowledge that tourist money is lost because Idaho has different ATV regulations than WA—need licensing change.
 - c. Work with local communities to determine what they want in tourism. Economic development and money or keep ‘rural,’ local, less people, etc.
 - d. FS and users must work together to reduce conflicts, which will reduce the loss of tourist dollars.
 - e. Incorporate Recreation and Tourism Strategy meeting which is being done in the Pend Oreille Valley.
- 2) Seek to understand the implications and effects of increasing tourism for local communities.
 - a. Need to get communities to realize potential of recreation areas and work with businesses to encourage economic development.
 - b. Need to maximize opportunity for all user groups, which will then maximize tourism and economic benefit. If we maximize the experience for one group at the expense of other user groups, this will be counter-productive to increased tourism.
 - c. With population increasing the CNF needs to maximize quality experience which may be difficult with increased use.
 - d. Co-sponsor the Selkirk Loop Bike Tour for 2004 to bring road cyclist enthusiasts to the region.
- 3) Obtain effective exposure for recreation travel tourism on the web.
 - a. Put out professional website—look into cost-sharing with businesses.
 - b. Website for recreation use, communication, and local tourism to maximize opportunities.

- 4) Determine CNF role in recreation travel tourism.
 - a. FS needs to incorporate recreation strategy meetings—disappointed that the business folks do not understand the implications of recreation travel.
 - b. FS should work with legislators on licensing issues.
 - c. FS should target marketing to user groups to attract to the area: ex, websites, email, etc. Market to photo groups, hikers, ATV users, etc. Be creative. Use state websites, REI (ex).
 - d. Make FS info available via public and private enterprises. ie brochures, maps, conditions of trails, etc.
 - e. Have FS information (maps, closures, regulations) available at local businesses. FS should work with local businesses in marketing opportunities: provide maps, info trail updates, etc.
 - f. Help local businesses learn how to take advantage of FS recreation opportunities
 - g. Forest should have more publicity of available, desirable areas.
 - h. The CNF needs to create ATV trail system with maps, markers, bridges, campgrounds, etc.
 - i. CNF needs to allocate money, incorporate recreation and tourism strategy meeting. Include people concerned with quality of life and ecological impacts.
- 5) Market tourism opportunities where appropriate.
 - a. Market trails so that there is accurate use of trails, which will result in proper use on the proper trails
 - b. Work with businesses in area to market.
 - c. Create pressure, brought by user groups, on the state legislature, to bring on a container deposit law in the state of WA (a beverage container deposit law).
 - d. Collaborative group participants should be reminded that there are forest users that are not represented directly at meetings: wildlife.
 - e. Targeted marketing to potential user groups: wildlife viewers, motorized users, hikers, hunters, etc.
 - f. Create worthwhile info provided about land designation so that people can tell where they should go to do the things they want to do.
 - g. Encourage more reasonable forest use.
 - h. Lands should be designated multi-use when possible and signed that way.
 - i. Leave the non-motorized areas and the motorized use as much alone as possible
 - j. Target marketing of user group to public
 - k. Roads on FS in Washington state require vehicle license even for rough 4WD roads.
 - l. Northeast Washington has edge in un-crowded outdoor recreation opportunities which is an advantage in drawing business and educated skilled workers.
 - m. Local attitude might be to keep out outsiders
 - n. Horse manure at trailhead offends urban users.

- o. Work with local businesses to develop recreation opportunities and marketing.
- p. Develop a trail around Pend Oreille River.
- q. Targeted marketing to user interest/class/activity: links to user group web sites
- r. Creation of a good motorized system could help protect the wildlife habitat and if motorize use requires licenses, fees, etc. This could also be a funding resource for wildlife habitat and motorized use.

GOAL 7 – Facilitate communication with and between user groups

Objectives of the goal

- 1) Create a forum for bridging motorized and non-motorized issues. Use the “advisory group” to achieve and approach this awesome task!!
 - a. Display where recreation areas are in order to better compromise.
 - b. Set expectations of users so that it reduces disappointment—users need to change expectations, or condition themselves to expect multi use, etc.
 - c. Mutual acceptance of all users.
 - d. Size of space: non-motorized users need more space for ‘tranquility,’ etc.
 - e. Motorized users need more miles because they can cover more distance.
 - f. Have work parties where multiple user groups can work together so that they can come to understand each other better.
 - g. FS needs to conduct/contract courses so others understand budget process, NEPA, etc.
 - h. Compromise between user groups.
 - i. Explain that speed is a safety issue for all users.
 - j. Education on areas available for non-motorized and motorized trails so both can be happy using appropriate trails.
 - k. Increase understanding that an increased population equals more forest users which increases the need for more compromise.
 - l. Need to educate non-motorized users that one encounter with a motorized user does not ruin their experience.
 - m. Lower expectations! Not for non-motorized users, but for motorized users.
 - n. Safety is paramount between user groups
 - o. Advisory committee is necessary so that user groups can learn to work together.
 - p. Non-motorized users need to recognize that some handicapped people may need to use motorized means to be able to access areas that they otherwise may not have a chance to see.
 - q. There is a certain threshold in which non-motorized users cannot accept motorized use. For me it is the illegal entries into non-motorized user areas and recklessness of numerous motorized users destroying ecological

resources (mud bogging) and disrupting the serenity and tranquility that non-motorized users seek. Furthermore motorized users need to understand and accept that their recreation activities are infringing on the non-motorized user experience and that solitude because noise and exhaust from motorized users can be heard and smelt from a much farther distance.

- r. It is much easier for motorized users to “cooperate” with each other. It basically boils down to getting around each other when they meet, after they cooperate with the passing, they are happily on their way. However, with solitude-seekers (hikers, snow-shoers, skiers) the noise and smell of fumes is constant on a busy day.
 - s. Needs to be a set of guidelines or principles agreed upon between motorized and non-motorized users.
- 2) Display the limitations of compromise.
- a. Motorized users “lose” when compromise is suggested. They are getting tired of losing. FS can’t pick on just one group.
 - b. Work toward compromise but don’t expect it in all instances...there are areas in which compromise is not possible.
 - c. No compromise: between motorized trails and non-motorized trails. This is easy to understand.
- 3) Display the benefits and detriments of multiple use areas.
- a. Lots of safety issues when running multiple uses on one trail.
 - b. Joint use in most cases can be compatible
 - c. Some combined trails OK but if all combined, having motorized and non-motorized together is like putting a kindergarten kid to play football with an NFL team.
 - d. Please sign every multi-use trail with use types and rules for use. Please create maps and rules clearly posted at trailheads.
- 4) Display the benefits and detriments of priority or exclusive use areas.
- a. Hunters need designated areas. Also need to retrieve game with ATVs—perhaps could purchase a special use permit for that reason.
 - b. Allow handicapped areas for ATV riding—slower speeds, etc
 - c. Open up cross country trails to 4-wheelers during summer
 - d. Users *want* to be sensitive to other user groups, therefore we may need to separate areas to allow for that. If trail is multi-use but not designed well for it, neither user group will have fun in the area. For example, hikers and ATV users can be compared to kindergarteners playing with football players. One group is afraid of getting hurt, the other afraid of hurting.
 - e. Restrictions against cross country travel
 - f. Provide for solitude for users, especially from motorized use.
 - g. FS should adopt a closed unless open policy.
 - h. Separate trails and areas are necessary for some users (horsemen and hikers) to enjoy their recreation time
 - i. CNF needs to operate their trail and road system as “closed unless marked open” via EO 11644 and 11989
- 5) Accept a role in cooperative efforts

- a. FS should establish an Advisory Group
 - b. Forest needs to manage *all* recreation use: if so, budget will increase, support will increase, and will be more positive
 - c. Info on how to share trails to be posted both at trailhead and along the trail
 - d. Recreational trail use advisory board to the Forest Service
 - e. FS clearing house for interaction between recreation groups.
 - f. Being to actively manage all recreation use
- 6) Create a safe and healthy recreation travel situation on the CNF.
- a. Safety: Speed and the bigger better faster more mentality can cause huge problems
 - b. Separate trails in areas for non-compatible users to reduce accidents/collisions

GOAL 8 – Protect the environment

Objectives of the goal

- 1) Determine unacceptable recreation travel effects.
 - a. FS should manage use and cross-country use by photo monitoring
 - b. *Any* use has impact on environment. FS needs to stimulate change where/when it needs to be done.
 - c. What about damage from cattle?
 - d. Monitor the same place over a long time. If the Forest actually knew what was going on with damage, they might have a leg to stand on when it came to closing something down.
 - e. Wildlife as a user group—need greater recognition of this.
 - f. Monitor impact of ORV use—use photos, videos.
 - g. Monitor impact of hiker use – use data to support closures.
- 2) Mitigate or reverse those effects to protect the environment.
 - a. Our needs are secondary to native needs: wildlife, nature.
 - b. Spread of noxious weeds is a concern
 - c. Impacts analysis and decision making of recreation needs to be based on laws, scientific integrity, and ecological carrying capacity.
 - d. Some areas are too sensitive—therefore those areas can cater only to certain groups.
 - e. Create a registration or reservation system to control use—others could then see what level of use to expect.
- 3) Use information and education to protect the environment.
 - a. Promote “leave no trace” to all groups at all locations
 - b. Train to be environmentally friendly
 - c. Conduct tours to damaged areas. Have similar tours to controlled areas for education purposes.
 - d. Educate recreation users on how fragile or not the areas is and on how the area is to be used.
- 4) Make physical changes to protect the environment.

- a. The CNF should implement a reservation system. It would require registration when you are in the forest, like a flight plan. It could be mandatory or non-mandatory.
 - b. FS manual trash compactors in various areas
 - c. Trash: empty containers law as in Oregon—will entice people to pack it in, pack it out to collect deposit
 - d. Dumpsters: locate in recreation areas, perhaps invent one with a manual wheel compaction system
 - e. Support multi-use trails: *design* of trail and trailhead is important to meet/exceed design/use expectations.
 - f. Larger use area for motorized vehicle use will avoid one area being used up or overused.
 - g. Design of trails and other locations to meet or exceed designated use. Support multi-use.
 - h. “Disperse rather than shrink area” –Amen!
 - i. Build trails to accommodate the use intended
 - j. Proper design for trail heads and track so any trails...will meet all uses.
 - k. Open more areas for multi-use
- 5) Make management changes to protect the environment.
- a. Design of trails for designated uses and management areas
 - b. FS needs change in increased management
 - c. FS needs to put more money toward increased management to keep down negative affects of the environment
 - d. Management of recreation trails should make threatened and endangered species a top concern.
 - e. Promote leave no trace philosophy!
 - f. Designate the acceptable use within each area based on ecological impacts. Restrict each use to designated trail and areas. Prohibit those uses outside of designated areas. “Closed if not signed open!”
 - g. Spread of noxious weeds is a problem
 - h. Decision making and planning must be based on scientific integrity and defensibility and ecological carrying capacity to protect resource damage
 - i. Decision making and planning must be legally binding to NEPA, ESA, Forest Plan, CWA, NFMA, FSH, EO etc,
 - j. Use registered hay
 - k. All users to remove their feces
 - l. Prohibit cattle grazing
 - m. Need to develop much greater understanding of how motorized use (and even non-motorized use) affects wildlife: prey species, predators, etc, and their habitat.
 - n. Our needs to use motorized vehicles in the forest must ultimately be acknowledge as secondary to wildlife needs. Our needs are in the context of “leisure time” while wildlife’s needs are in the context of home, habitat, roaming, breeding, and feeding needs.

- o. To see some form of permit or way for elderly and handicapped to get into some areas that are now closed to get game from walk in areas.
- p. Tearing up the landscape, defacing. To broad the effect for that special interest.
- q. Let's not lose trails! Shrinking will only cause more impact on main trails
- r. Design trail for the intended use! Horse, ATV, etc
- s. Better separation of hikers and motorized vehicles.
- t. Some trails not appropriate for motorized vehicles
- u. Designated ORV areas should be based on ecological impacts and effects on non-motorized users and wildlife.
- v. Close areas that are impacted by ORV use or other recreational trail use.
- w. Require ORV vehicle licenses. Post ORV speed limit on mixed use trails.
- x. Close pioneered trails and repair damage
- y. Prohibit pioneering of trails and roads and have sufficient penalties to deter use. Require violators to repair damage.
 - i. There needs to be direct relationship between funding levels and specific use levels. That way negative resource compaction can be monitored and mitigated and maintained.

Where do we go from here??

The next logical step for the Recreation Travel Strategy is to form an enthusiast and concerned citizen forum. The details of how this will be done must be left to the group to help decide. The Colville National Forest Leadership Team is supportive of this next step. A process for deciding on priority potential projects or ideas must be determined and presented to the Forest Leadership team.